arXiv:1402.7327v2 [math.DS] 3 Mar 2014

Weak forms of topological and measure theoretical equicontinuity: relationships with discrete spectrum and sequence entropy

Felipe García-Ramos
felipegra@math.ubc.ca
University of British Columbia

March 4, 2014

Abstract

We define weaker forms of topological and measure theoretical equicontinuity for topological dynamical systems and we study their relationships with systems with discrete spectrum and zero sequence entropy.

In the topological category we show systems with zero topological sequence entropy are strictly contained in the weakly equicontinuous systems; and that transitive almost automorphic systems are weakly equicontinuous if and only if they are regular (i.e. the maximal equicontinuous factor map is 1-1 on a set of full Haar measure).

In the measure category we show that for ergodic topological systems having discrete spectrum is equivalent of being μ-very weakly equicontinuous.

For both categories we find characterizations using stronger versions of the classical notion of sensitivity.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Topological results **3**
2.1 Weak equicontinuity 5
2.2 Strong sensitivity 6
2.3 Topological sequence entropy 9
2.4 Almost automorphic systems 10
2.5 Counter-examples 13

3 Measure theoretical results **14**
3.1 $\mu-$Very weak equicontinuity 15
3.2 $\mu-$Very strong sensitivity 17

3.3 $\mu-$Very strong sensitive pairs 20
3.4 Discrete spectrum and sequence entropy 22

1 Introduction

A topological dynamical system (TDS), (X, T), is a continuous transformation T (or more generally a continuous action) on a compact metric space X. The dynamical behaviour of these systems can range from very rigid to very chaotic. On the extreme side of rigid behaviour is equicontinuity: a TDS is equicontinuous if the family $\{T^i\}$ is equicontinuous, or equivalently, if two points $x, y \in X$ are close, then $T^i(x), T^i(y)$ stay close for *all* i. The prototype for an equicontinuous TDS is a rotation on a compact abelian group and it is well known that any transitive equicontinuous TDS is topologically conjugate to such a rotation.

It is easy to see that any equicontinuous TDS has zero topological entropy. There is a finer notion of topological entropy, known as topological sequence entropy. A TDS that has zero topological sequence entropy is known as a null system, and it is well known that equicontinuity implies null, but the converse is false [16]. Nevertheless, one can ask if there is a sense in which every null TDS is "nearly" equicontinuous. Indeed, in the minimal case there is. Any TDS has a unique maximal equicontinuous factor [3], and Huang-Li–Shao-Ye [21] showed that for any minimal null TDS (X, T), the factor map from X to its maximal equicontinuous factor is 1-1 on a residual set (i.e., (X, T) is almost automorphic). We strengthen this result, in Corollary 30, by showing that the factor map is 1-1 on a set of full Haar measure (i.e., (X, T) is regular).

In order to establish Corollary 30, we introduce a weak topological form of equicontinuity, which we call weak equicontinuity, which requires that if $x, y \in X$ are close, then in some sense $T^i(x), T^i(y)$ stay close for *most* i. We show that for minimal TDS, null implies weak equicontinuity (Corollary 24) and that an almost automorphic TDS is weakly equicontinuous if and only if it is regular (Theorem 29).

For transitive TDS, equicontinuous maps can be characterized as those with topological discrete spectrum, i.e., the induced operator on $C(X)$ has discrete spectrum (see e.g. [39]). This fact has its roots in the classical result of Halmos and von Neumann [19] that an ergodic measure-preserving transformation (MPT) T has discrete spectrum if and only if it is measure-theoretically isomorphic to a rotation S on a compact abelian group; here, the measure on the group is the Haar probability measure, and the spectrum refers to the spectrum of the operator induced by T on L^2.

Now consider the hybrid situation of a TDS that is also an MPT, i.e., a continuous map T on a compact metric space X endowed with a Borel probability measure μ such that T preserves μ. If, as an MPT, T has discrete spectrum, it is natural to ask how much of the equicontinuity of a rotation, as a TDS, must be preserved by the isomorphism between T and the rotation.

Gilman [14][13] introduced a notion of μ-equicontinuity for cellular automata and later Huang-Lu-Ye [22] introduced a different definition of μ-equicontinuity (which was shown to be equivalent in [10]) and showed that μ-equicontinuous systems have discrete spectrum. We introduce a weakening of μ-equicontinuity that we call μ-very weak equicontinuity, and we show that an ergodic measure-preserving TDS has discrete spectrum if and only if it is μ-very weakly equicontinuous (Corollary 57).

For this result, we make use of Kushnirenko's characterization of MPT's with discrete spectrum as those with zero measure-theoretic sequence entropy [29] (Kushnirenko introduced this notion of sequence entropy long before the topological notion mentioned above).

TDS that exhibit chaotic behaviour are known by various forms of sensitivity. Akin-Auslander-Berg [1] showed that for minimal TDS, there is a dichotomy between the classical notions of equicontinuity and sensitivity. We introduce corresponding stronger versions of our weaker forms of equicontinuity and establish dichotomies.

The definitions are stated for amenable semigroup actions, and all the results hold at least for countable discrete abelian semigroups (for example $\mathbb{Z}_+^d$). Nevertheless, the results are new even in the $\mathbb{Z}_+$-setting and the notation was chosen so the reader can focus on that case.

Acknowledgements: I would like to thank Karl Petersen and Tomasz Downarowicz for conversations that inspired this paper, Brian Marcus for his suggestions and always enjoyable conversations, Boris Solomyak for inviting me to discuss related topics, and Xiangdong Ye for his comments.

2 Topological results

Let $(\mathbb{G},+)$ be a locally compact semigroup. A $\mathbb{G}$ **-topological dynamical system ($\mathbb{G}-$TDS)** is a pair (X,T), where X is a compact metric space and $T := \left\{T^i : i \in \mathbb{G}\right\}$ is a $\mathbb{G}-$ continuous action on X. When the group is not specified we simply call (X,T) a TDS.

The metric and $\varepsilon-$balls on a compact metric space X will be denoted by d, and $B_\varepsilon(x)$ respectively.

Definition 1 *Let $(\mathbb{G},+)$ be a locally compact semigroup that has an invariant measure ν. We say $\mathbb{G}$ is **amenable** if there exist a **Følner sequence,** i.e. a sequence of measurable sets with finite measure $\{F_n\} \subset \mathbb{G}$, such that for any $i \in \mathbb{G}$ we have that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\nu((i+F_n) \triangle F_n)}{\nu(F_n)} = 0.$$

For other characterizations of amenability see [35].

If the group is countable then any invariant measure is the counting measure. In this case if F is compact then F is finite and $\nu(F) = |F|$.

A semigroup $(\mathbb{G},+)$ is **left cancellative** if whenever $a+b=a+c$ we have that $b=c$.

Throughout this paper we assume $(\mathbb{G},+)$ is an amenable left cancellative locally compact semigroup with identity (0) that has an invariant measure ν (in the case where $\mathbb{G}$ is a group there is always a (left) invariant measure and it is known as the Haar measure).

From now on $\mathbb{G}$ implicitly represents a pair consisting of a semigroup and a Følner sequence.

Abelian semigroups are amenable; in particular $\mathbb{Z}_+^d$, and $\mathbb{R}_+^d$ are amenable (in these cases we associate the cubes of size n as the Følner sequence).

A TDS is **equicontinuous** if T is an equicontinuous family.

We can work with a weaker form of equicontinuity. To do this we need to be able to measure how large is a subset of $\mathbb{G}$; upper density can be defined on amenable semigroups. We define two different weaker notions of equicontinuity, weak and very weak equicontinuity.

For these new forms of equicontinuity we define their corresponding sensitivity notions (strong and very strong sensitivity) and show the existence of dichotomies when (X,T) is minimal or transitive.

It is known that equicontinuous systems have zero topological sequence entropy (null systems) and that there are non-equicontinuous systems with zero topological sequence entropy [16].

In this section we show that for minimal systems, zero topological sequence entropy minimal systems are strictly contained in the weakly equicontinuous systems.

We will see that we have the following picture:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \text{very strongly sensitive} & \Longrightarrow & \text{strongly sensitive} \\ & \Longrightarrow & \text{positive topological sequence entropy} \\ & \Longrightarrow & \text{non-equicontinuous.} \end{array}$$

Each implication is strict. For minimal systems we have the following implications:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \text{equicontinuous} & \Longrightarrow & \text{null} \\ & \Longrightarrow & \text{weakly equicontinuous} \\ & \Longrightarrow & \text{very weakly equicontinuous.} \end{array}$$

We will characterize weak equicontinuity on almost automorphic TDS. A TDS is almost automorphic if the maximal equicontinuous factor map is 1-1 on a residual set. If the system is transitive the maximal equicontinuous factor is a group (where the Haar probability measure is the unique ergodic probability measure). We show that every transitive almost automorphic TDS is weakly equicontinuous if and only if the maximal equicontinuous factor is 1-1 on a set of full Haar measure (Theorem 30). We do not know if there are weakly

equicontinuous systems that are not almost automorphic, but it is known that null systems are almost automorphic [21]. This means that null systems are regular almost automorphic TDS (Corollary 31).

2.1 Weak equicontinuity

Let (X_1, T_1) and (X_2, T_2) be two TDS and $f : X_1 \to X_2$ a continuous function such that $f \circ T_1 = T_2 \circ f$.

If f is surjective we say f is a **factor map** and (X_2, T_2) is a **factor** of (X_1, T_1). If f is bijective we say f is a **conjugacy** and (X_1, T_1) and (X_2, T_2) are **conjugate (topologically)**.

Definition 2 *Let $S \subset \mathbb{G}$. We define **lower density** as*

$$\underline{D}(S) := \lim \inf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\nu(S \cap F_n)}{\nu(F_n)},$$

*and **upper density** as*

$$\overline{D}(S) := \lim \sup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\nu(S \cap F_n)}{\nu(F_n)}.$$

The following properties are easy to prove and will be used throughout the paper.

Lemma 3 *Let $S, S' \subset \mathbb{G}$, $i \in \mathbb{G}$, $0 \leq a \leq 1$ and $F \subset \mathbb{G}$ a finite set. We have that*

$\cdot \underline{D}(S) = \underline{D}(i + S)$ and $\overline{D}(S) = \overline{D}(i + S)$.
$\cdot$ If $\underline{D}(S) + \overline{D}(S') > 1$ then $S \cap S' \neq \emptyset$.
$\cdot$ If $\underline{D}(S) \leq a$ then $\overline{D}(S^c) > a$.
$\cdot$ If $\mathbb{G}$ is countable

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{D}(S) &: = \lim \inf_{n\to\infty} \frac{|S \cap F_n \setminus F|}{|F_n \setminus F|}, \text{ and} \\ \overline{D}(S) &: = \lim \sup_{n\to\infty} \frac{|S \cap F_n \setminus F|}{|F_n \setminus F|}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 4 *Let (X, T) be a TDS. We say $x \in X$ is a **very weak equicontinuity point** if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $y \in B_\delta(x)$ then $\overline{D}(i \in : d(T^i x, T^i y) \leq \varepsilon) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. We say (X, T) is **very weakly equicontinuous** if every $x \in X$ is a very weak equicontinuity point. We say (X, T) is **almost very weakly equicontinuous** if the set of very weak equicontinuity points is residual.*

We will see that very weak equicontinuity can be defined naturally using the Besicovitch pseudometric (see Section 2.4).

Using the fact that a continuous function on a compact set is uniformly continuous we will see that (X, T) is very weakly equicontinuous if and only if is is uniformly very weakly equicontinuous i.e. for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $d(x, y) \leq \delta$ then $\overline{D}(i \in : d(T^i x, T^i y) \leq \varepsilon) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ (See Remark 25).

Definition 5 *Let (X,T) be a TDS. We say $x \in X$ is a* ***weak equicontinuity point*** *if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ and $S \subset \mathbb{G}$ such that $\overline{D}(S) \geq 1-\varepsilon$ and $d(T^i x, T^i y) \leq \varepsilon$ for every $y \in B_\delta(x)$ and $i \in S$. We say (X,T) is* ***weakly equicontinuous*** *if every point is a weak equicontinuity point. We say (X,T) is* ***almost weakly equicontinuous*** *if the set of weak equicontinuity points is residual.*

By adapting the proof that a continuous function on a compact space is uniformly continuous one can show that weakly equicontinuous systems are uniformly weakly equicontinuous i.e. for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for every $x \in X$ there exists $S \subset \mathbb{G}$, with $\overline{D}(S) \geq 1-\varepsilon$, such that $d(T^i x, T^i y) \leq \varepsilon$ for every $y \in B_\delta(x)$ and $i \in S$.

Note that every weakly equicontinuous system is very weakly equicontinuous but the converse is not true (see Example 32).

Definition 6 *Let (X,T) be a TDS. We say $x \in X$ is a* ***transitive point*** *if the orbit of x is dense. We say (X,T) is* ***transitive*** *if X contains a transitive point. If every $x \in X$ is transitive then we say the system is* ***minimal****.*

It is well known that transitive equicontinuous system are minimal. We give a similar result by weakening one hypothesis and strengthening the other.

Definition 7 *A TDS (X,T) is* ***strongly transitive*** *if for every open set U there exists a transitive point $x \in U$ that returns to U with positive lower density.*

Theorem 8 *Every strongly transitive very weakly equicontinuous system is minimal.*

Proof. Let $x, y \in X$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Since the system is strongly transitive there exists a transitive point $z \in B_{\varepsilon/2}(y)$ such that $a := \underline{D}\left\{i : T^i z \in B_{\varepsilon/2}(y)\right\} > 0$. Since the system is weakly equicontinuous there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $w \in B_\delta(x)$ then $d_b(x,w) \leq \min\{\varepsilon/2, a\}$. There exists $t_1 \in \mathbb{G}$ such that $T^{t_1} z \in B_\delta(x)$. There exists $t_2 \in \mathbb{G}$ such that $T^{t_2} z \in B_{\varepsilon/2}(y)$ and $d(T^{t_2} x, T^{t_2} z) \leq \varepsilon/2$; thus $T^{t_2} x \in B_\varepsilon(y)$ (see Lemma 3). This means the system is minimal. ■

A similar result is known for null systems (which are a subfamily of the weak equicontinuous systems; see Definition 20 and Corollary 23), i.e. every Banach transitive null system is minimal [21]. It is an open question whether every transitive null system is minimal.

2.2 Strong sensitivity

Definition 9 *A TDS (X,T) is* ***sensitive to initial conditions (or sensitive)*** *if there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every open set $A \subset X$ there exists $x, y \in A$ and $i \in \mathbb{G}$ such that $d(T^i x, T^i y) > \varepsilon$.*

In [1] it was shown that for transitive systems there is a dichotomy between almost equicontinuity and sensitivity, and for minimal systems one with equicontinuity and sensitivity.

In this subsection we study the corresponding sensitivity concepts to our notions of equicontinuity and we show the existence of dichotomies for both cases.

Definition 10 *We denote the set of very weak equicontinuity points by E^{vw} and we define*

$$E^{vw}_{\varepsilon} := \left\{ x \in X : \exists \delta > 0 \ \forall y, z \in B_{\delta}(x), \ \overline{D}\left\{ i \in \mathbb{G} : d(T^i y, T^i z) \leq \varepsilon \right\} > 1 - \varepsilon \ \right\}.$$

Note that $E^{vw} = \cap_{\varepsilon} E^{vw}_{\varepsilon}$.

Lemma 11 *Let (X,T) be a TDS. The sets E^{vw} and E^{vw}_{ε} are inversely invariant (i.e. $T^{-j}(E^{vw}) \subseteq E^{vw}$ and $T^{-j}(E^{vw}_{\varepsilon}) \subseteq E^{vw}_{\varepsilon}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{G}$) and E^{vw}_{ε} is open.*

Proof. Let $j \in \mathbb{G}$, $\varepsilon > 0$, $T^j x \in E^{vw}_{\varepsilon}$. There exists $\eta > 0$ and $S \subset \mathbb{G}$ (with $\overline{D}(S) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$) such that if $d(T^j x, z) \leq \eta$ then $d(T^i x, T^i z) \leq \varepsilon$ for all $i \in S$. There exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $d(x,y) < \delta$ then $d(T^j x, T^j y) < \eta$. We conclude that $x \in E^{vw}_{\varepsilon}$. This implies E^{vw} is also inversely invariant.

Let $x \in E^{vw}_{\varepsilon}$ and $\delta > 0$ a constant that satisfies the property of the definition of E^{vw}_{ε}. If $d(x,w) < \delta/2$ then $w \in E^{vw}_{\varepsilon}$. Indeed if $y, z \in B_{\delta/2}(w)$ then $y, z \in B_{\delta}(x)$. ■

Definition 12 *A TDS (X,T) is **very strongly sensitive** if there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every open set U there exists $x, y \in U$ and $S \subset \mathbb{G}$ with $\underline{D}(S) > \varepsilon$ such that $d(T^i x, T^i y) > \varepsilon$ for every $i \in S$.*

Other strong forms of sensitivity have been studied in [33] where S was taken to be cofinite (complement is finite) or syndetic (bounded gaps).

It is not hard to see that very strongly sensitive systems have no very weakly equicontinuity points, as a matter of fact we have the following dichotomies.

Theorem 13 *A transitive system is either almost very weakly equicontinuous or very strongly sensitive. A minimal system is either very weakly equicontinuous or very strongly sensitive.*

Proof. First we show that if (X,T) is a transitive system then E^{w}_{ε} is either empty or dense. Assume E^{vw}_{ε} is non-empty and not dense. Then $U = X \setminus \overline{E^{vw}_{\varepsilon}}$ is a non-empty open set. Since the system is transitive and E^{vw}_{ε} is open (Lemma 11) there exists $t \in \mathbb{G}$ such that $U \cap T^{-t}(E^{vw}_{\varepsilon})$ is non empty. By Lemma 11 we have that $U \cap T^{-t}(E^{vw}_{\varepsilon}) \subset U \cap E^{vw}_{\varepsilon} = \emptyset$; a contradiction.
If E^{vw}_{ε} is non-empty for every $\varepsilon > 0$ then we have that $E^{vw} = \cap_{n \geq 1} E^{vw}_{1/n}$ is a residual set; hence the system is almost weakly equicontinuous.

If there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ such that E^{vw}_{ε} is empty, then for any open ball $U = B_{\delta}(x)$ there exists $y, z \in B_{\delta}(x)$ such that $\overline{D}\left\{ i \in \mathbb{G} : d(T^i y, T^i z) \leq \varepsilon \right\} \leq 1 - \varepsilon$, this means that $\underline{D}\left\{ i \in \mathbb{G} : d(T^i y, T^i z) > \varepsilon \right\} > \varepsilon$. It follows that (X,T) is very strongly sensitive.

Now suppose (X,T) is minimal and almost very weakly equicontinuous. For every $x \in X$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $t \in \mathbb{G}$ such that $T^t x \in E^{vw}_\varepsilon$. Since E^{vw}_ε is inversely invariant $x \in E^{vw}_\varepsilon$ and hence $x \in E^{vw}$. ■

The following proposition shows that for minimal systems we can equivalently define very weak equicontinuity using lower density and very strong sensitivity using upper density.

Proposition 14 *Let (X,T) be a minimal TDS. The following are equivalent.*

1) *(X,T) is very weakly equicontinuous.*

2) *(X,T) is not very strongly sensitive.*

3) *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $d(x,y) \leq \delta$ then*

$$\underline{D}\left\{i \in \mathbb{G} : d(T^i x, T^i y) \leq \varepsilon\right\} \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

4) *There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every open set U there exists $x, y \in U$ such that*

$$\overline{D}\left\{i \in \mathbb{G} : d(T^i x, T^i y) > \varepsilon\right\} > \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Theorem 13 shows 1) $\Leftrightarrow$ 2). Actually with an analogous proof we can show 3) $\Leftrightarrow$ 4). Finally, 3) $\Rightarrow$ 1) and 2) $\Rightarrow$ 4) are obvious. ■

Now we obtain similar results for weak equicontinuity.

Definition 15 *We denote the set of weak equicontinuity points by E^w and we define*

$$E^w_\varepsilon := \left\{x \in X : \exists \delta > 0, S \subset \mathbb{G} \text{ s.t. } \overline{D}(S) > 1-\varepsilon,\ d(T^i y, T^i z) \leq \varepsilon\ \forall i \in S\ \forall y,z \in B_\delta(x)\right\}.$$

Note that $E^w = \cap_\varepsilon E^w_\varepsilon$.

Lemma 16 *Let (X,T) be a TDS. The sets E^w and E^w_ε are inversely invariant (i.e. $T^{-j}(E^w) \subseteq E^w$ and $T^{-j}(E^w_\varepsilon) \subseteq E^w_\varepsilon$ for all $j \in \mathbb{G}$) and E^w_ε is open.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $Tx \in E^w_\varepsilon$ and . There exists $\eta > 0$ and $S \subset \mathbb{G}$ such that $\underline{D}(S) > 1 - \varepsilon$ and $d(T^i x, T^i z) < \varepsilon$ for every $i \in S$ and $z \in B_\eta(x)$. There exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $d(x,y) < \delta$ then $d(Tx,Ty) < \eta$. We conclude that $x \in E^w_\varepsilon$. Thus $T^{-1}(E^w) \subseteq E^w$.

Let $x \in E^w$ and take $\delta > 0$ a constant that satisfies the property of the definition of E^w. If $d(x,w) < \delta/2$ then $w \in E^w$. Indeed if $y,z \in B_{\delta/2}(w)$ then $y,z \in B_\delta(x)$. ■

Definition 17 *A TDS (X,T) is **strongly sensitive** if there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every open set U there exists $S \subset \mathbb{G}$ with $\underline{D}(S) > \varepsilon$ such that for every $i \in S$ there exists $x, y \in U$ such that $d(T^i x, T^i y) > \varepsilon$. In this case we say ε is a **sensitive constant.***

The proof of the following results are analogous to that of Theorem 13 and Proposition 14.

Theorem 18 *A transitive system is either almost weak equicontinuous or strongly sensitive. A minimal system is either weakly equicontinuous or strongly sensitive.*

Proposition 19 *Let (X,T) be a minimal TDS. The following are equivalent.*

1) *(X,T) is weakly equicontinuous.*

2) *(X,T) is not strongly sensitive.*

3) *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for every $x \in X$ there exists $S \subset \mathbb{G}$, with $\underline{D}(S) \geq 1-\varepsilon$, such that $d(T^i x, T^i y) \leq \varepsilon$ for every $y \in B_\delta(x)$ and $i \in S$.*

4) *There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every open set U there exists $S \subset \mathbb{G}$ with $\overline{D}(S) > \varepsilon$ such that for every $i \in S$ there exists $x, y \in U$ such that $d(T^i x, T^i y) > \varepsilon$.*

2.3 Topological sequence entropy

Let $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ be two open covers of X. We define $\mathcal{U} \vee \mathcal{V} := \{U \cap V : U \in \mathcal{U}\ , V \in \mathcal{V}\}$ and $N(\mathcal{U})$ as the minimum cardinality of a subcover of $\mathcal{U}$.

Definition 20 ([16]) *Let (X,T) be a TDS, $S = \{s_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathbb{G}$, and $\mathcal{U}$ an open cover. We define*

$$h_{top}^S(T,\mathcal{U}) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \sup \frac{1}{n} N(\vee_{m=1}^n T^{-s_m}(\mathcal{U})).$$

*The **topological entropy along the sequence S** is defined by*

$$h_{top}^S(T) := \sup_{open\ covers\ \mathcal{U}} h_{top}^S(T,\mathcal{U})$$

*A TDS is **null** if the topological entropy along every sequence is zero.*

Lemma 21 *Let K be a finite set, $\varepsilon > 0$, and $h : K \to 2^{\mathbb{G}}$ such that $\underline{D}(h(k)) > \varepsilon$ for every $k \in F$. There exists $K' \subset K$ and $i \in \mathbb{G}$ such that $|K'| \geq \varepsilon |K| / 2$ such that $i \in h(k)$ for every $k \in K'$.*

Proof. There exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\frac{\nu(h(k) \cap F_{n_0})}{\nu(F_{n_0})} \geq \varepsilon/2 \quad \text{for every } k \in K.$$

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a finite family of disjoint subsets of F_{n_0}, such that $\nu(B)$ is constant for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and for every $k \in K$ there exists $\mathcal{B}_k \subset \mathcal{B}$ such that

$$\nu(h(k) \cap F_{n_0}) = \nu(\cup_{B \in \mathcal{B}_k} B).$$

This means that

$$\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} |k \in K : B \subset h(k)| = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} |B \in \mathcal{B} : B \subset h(k)| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} |K| \, |\mathcal{B}| .$$

Hence there exists $B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $|k \in K : B \subset h(k)| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} |K|$. ■

Theorem 22 *Let (X,T) be a TDS. If (X,T) is strongly sensitive then there exists $S \subset \mathbb{G}$ such that $h^S_{top}(T) > 0$.*

Proof. Let (X,T) be strongly sensitive with sensitive constant ε. Let $\mathcal{U} := \{U_1, ...U_N\}$ be a finite open cover with balls with radius smaller than $\varepsilon/2$.

We will define the sequence $S^n = \{s_1, ..., s_n\}$ inductively with $s_1 = 1$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we define $L_n := \left\{\cap_{i=1}^n T^{-s_i} U_{v_i} \neq \emptyset : v \in \{1, ..., N\}^{S^n}\right\}$ (N is the size of the cover), and the function $f : L_n \to 2^{\mathbb{G}}$ as follows; $m \in f(U)$ if and only if there exists $x, y \in U$ such that $d(T^m x, T^m y) > \varepsilon$.

Assume S^n is defined. Since (X,T) is strongly sensitive we have that $\underline{D}(f(U)) > \varepsilon$ for every $U \in L_n$. By Lemma 21 there exists $g \in \mathbb{G}$ such that $\frac{|\{U \in L_n : m \in f(U)\}|}{|L_n|} > \varepsilon/2$; we define $s_{n+1} := g$. This means that $\frac{|L_{n+1}|}{|L_n|} > 1 + \varepsilon/2$. Let $S^\infty := \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} S^n$. Since $|L_n| = N(\vee_{i \in S^n} T^{-s_i}(\mathcal{U}))$, we conclude that $h^{S^\infty}_{top}(T, \mathcal{U}) > 0$. ■

Corollary 23 *Let (X,T) be a minimal TDS. If (X,T) is null then it is weakly equicontinuous.*

The converse is not true (Proposition 36). Nonetheless we will show that, under discrete abelian actions, zero measure sequence entropy and $\mu-$very weak equicontinuity are the same thing (Corollary 59). If (X,T) is very weakly equicontinuous and μ an ergodic measure then (X,T) is $\mu-$very weakly equicontinuous, and hence it has zero entropy.

2.4 Almost automorphic systems

Any TDS (X,T) has a unique (up to conjugacy) **maximal equicontinuous factor** i.e. a factor $f_{eq} : (X,T) \to (X_{eq}, T_{eq})$ such that if $f_2 : (X,T) \to (X_2, T_2)$ is a factor map such that (X_2, T_2) is equicontinuous then there exists a unique factor $g : (X_1, T_1) \to (X_2, T_2)$ such that $g \circ f_{eq} = f_2$. The equivalence relation whose equivalence classes are the fibers of f_{eq} is called the **equicontinuous structure relation**. This relation can be characterized using the regionally proximal relation. We say that $x, y \in X$ are **regionally proximal** if there exist sequences $\{t_n\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{G}$ and $\{x^n\}_{n=1}^\infty, \{y^n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset X$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} x^n = x, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} y^n = y, \text{ and } \lim_{n\to\infty} d(T^{t_n} x^n, T^{t_n} y^n) = 0.$$

The equicontinuous structure relation is the smallest closed equivalence relation containing the regional proximal relation ([3] Chapter 9).

It will also be useful to describe very weak equicontinuity in terms of the Besicovitch pseudometric.

Definition 24 *We define $\Delta_\delta(x,y) := \left\{i \in \mathbb{G} \mid d(T^i x, T^i y) > \delta\right\}$ and the **Besicovitch pseudometric** as $d_b(x,y) := \inf\left\{\delta \mid \overline{D}(\Delta_\delta(x,y)) < \delta\right\}$. By identifying points that are at pseudo-distance zero we obtain a TDS $((X/d_b, d_b), T)$ that will*

be called the ***Besicovitch factor.*** *The projection $f_b : (X,d) \to (X/d_b, d_b)$ will be called the* ***Besicovitch factor map.*** *The ε balls of the Besicovitch pseudometric will be denoted by $B^b_\varepsilon(x)$.*

It is not difficult to see that $x \in X$ is a very weak equicontinuity point if and only if f_b is continuous at x.

Remark 25 *If (X,T) is very weakly equicontinuous then f_b is continuous, since X is compact this means f_b is uniformly continuous, this means that (X,T) is uniformly very weakly equicontinuous i.e. for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $d(x,y) \leq \delta$ then $\overline{D}(i \in: d(T^i x, T^i y) \leq \varepsilon) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$.*

In [5] equicontinuity with respect to the Besicovitch pseudometric was studied for cellular automata; this is a different property than weak or very weak equicontinuity.

It is not difficult to see that if $d_b(x,y) = 0$ then there exists a sequence $\{t_n\}$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} d(T^{t_n}x, T^{t_n}y) = 0$; hence x and y are regionally proximal. This means that if (X,T) is very weakly equicontinuous then $f_{eq} = f_b$.

A transitive equicontinuous system is conjugate to a a system where $\mathbb{G}$ acts as a translation on a compact metric abelian group. If (X,T) is a transitive TDS we denote the maximal equicontinuous fact by G_{eq} (since it is a group). The TDS (G_{eq}, T_{eq}) has a unique ergodic invariant probability measure, the normalized Haar measure; this measure has full support and will be denoted by ν_{eq}.

Definition 26 *We say a TDS is* ***almost automorphic*** *if it is an almost 1-1 extension of its maximal equicontinuous factor i.e. if $f_{eq}^{-1} f_{eq}(x) = x$ on a residual set. A transitive almost automorphic TDS is* ***regular*** *if*

$$\nu_{eq}\left\{g \in G_{eq} : f_{eq}^{-1}(g) \text{ is a singleton}\right\} = 1.$$

It is not difficult to see that if x is transitive and $f_{eq}^{-1} f_{eq}(x) = x$ then (X,T) is almost automorphic.

Two well known families of almost automorphic systems are the Sturmian subshifts, which are extensions of rotations of the circle group, and Toeplitz subshifts, which are extensions of rotations of odometers (see Section 2.5 for definition and examples).

An important class of TDS are the shift systems. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a compact metric space (with metric $d_{\mathcal{A}}$) and $\mathbb{G}$ a countable group. For $x \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{G}}$ and $i \in \mathbb{G}$ we use x_i to denote the ith coordinate of x and

$$\sigma := \left\{\sigma^i : \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{G}} \to \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{G}} \;\middle|\; x_{i+j} = (\sigma^i x)_j \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{G}} \text{and } j \in \mathbb{G}\right\}$$

to denote the **shift maps**. Using the Cantor product topology, we have that $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{G}}$ is a compact metrizable space. A subset $X \subset \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{G}}$ is a **general shift system** if it is closed and $\sigma-$invariant; in this case (X,σ) is a TDS. Every TDS is conjugate to a general shift system (by mapping every point to its orbit).

A general shift system is a **subshift** if $\mathcal{A}$ is finite.

Remark 27 *Let $X \subset \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{G}}$ be a general shift system. We have that (X,σ) is weakly equicontinuous if and only if for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for all $x \in X$ there exists $S \subset \mathbb{G}$ with $\overline{D}(S) \geq 1-\varepsilon$, such that if $d(x,y) \leq \delta$ then $d_{\mathcal{A}}(x_i, y_i) \leq \varepsilon$ for all $i \in S$.*

Definition 28 *Let (X,σ) be a transitive general shift system. We define*

$$C := \{g \in G_{eq} : \exists x, y \text{ such that } f_{eq}(x) = f_{eq}(y) = g \text{ and } x_0 \neq y_0\}.$$

If (X,σ) is almost automorphic we have that $f_{eq}^{-1}(C^c)$ is a residual open set. This means C is a nowhere dense compact set . Also note that (X,σ) is regular if and only if $\nu_{eq}(C) = 0$.

Lemma 29 *Let $\mathbb{G}$ be countable, (X,σ) a transitive almost automorphic $\mathbb{G}-TDS$ and $F \subset \mathbb{G}$ a finite set. Then for all $g \in G_{eq}$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{G}$ such that $\sigma_{eq}^{k+i}(g) \notin C$ for all $i \in F$.*

Proof. Let $C' := \cup_{i \in F'} \sigma_{eq}^{-i}(C)$. This means that C' is also closed and nowhere dense. Thus there exists k such that $\sigma_{eq}^{k}(g) \in G - C'$, hence $\sigma_{eq}^{k+i}(g) \notin C$ for all $i \in F$. ■

For the following results in this subsection we assume $(G_{eq}, \nu_{eq}, T_{eq})$ satisfies the pointwise ergodic theorem (for conditions when this is satisfied see introduction of Section 3).

Theorem 30 *Let $\mathbb{G}$ be countable and (X,T) a transitive almost automorphic $\mathbb{G}-TDS$ where $(G_{eq}, \nu_{eq}, T_{eq})$ satisfies the pointwise ergodic theorem. Then (X,T) is weakly equicontinuous if and only if it is regular.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we assume (X,T) is a general shift system (X,σ).

Suppose (X,σ) is a weakly equicontinuous (so $f_b = f_{eq}$). Let $\varepsilon > 0$, and $\delta > 0$ given by Remark 27.

Let $x \in X$. Note that $\sigma^i(x) \in f_{eq}^{-1}(C)$ if and only if there exists $y \in f_b^{-1} \circ f_b(x)$ such that $y_i \neq x_i$.

By the previous lemma there exists $k \in \mathbb{G}$ such that if $f_{eq}(x) = f_{eq}(y)$ then $d(\sigma^k y, \sigma^k x) \leq \delta$.

Since (X,σ) is a weakly equicontinuous there exists $S \subset \mathbb{G}$ with $\overline{D}(S) \geq 1-\varepsilon$, such that if $d(\sigma^k x, \sigma^k y) \leq \delta$ then $d(x_i, y_i) \leq \varepsilon$ for all $i \in S$.

This means that for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\overline{D}\left\{i : \exists y \in f_b^{-1} \circ f_b(x) \text{ s.t. } d_{\mathcal{A}}(x_i, y_i) > \varepsilon\right\} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Considering that

$$C = \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{g \in G_{eq} : \exists x, y \text{ s.t } f_{eq}(x) = f_{eq}(y) = g \text{ and } d_{\mathcal{A}}(x_0, y_0) > 1/n\},$$

and the pointwise ergodic theorem we conclude that $\nu_{eq}(C) = 0$.

Suppose that $\nu_{eq}(C) = 0$. Hence for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $U := \{x \mid d(x, C) \leq \delta\}$ then $\nu(U) < \varepsilon$. Let $x \in X$. We define $S := \{i \in \mathbb{G} \mid x_i \notin U\}$; hence $\overline{D}(S) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. We conclude (X, σ) is weakly equicontinuous because if $d(x, y) \leq \delta$ then $d_{\mathcal{A}}(x_i, y_i) \leq \varepsilon$ for all $i \in S$. ■

If $\mathbb{G}$ is an abelian group then every minimal null $\mathbb{G}-$TDS is almost automorphic [21][20]. Using Corollary 23 we obtain a stronger result.

Corollary 31 *Let $\mathbb{G}$ be a countable abelian group and (X, T) be a minimal $\mathbb{G}-$TDS. If (X, T) is null then it is a regular almost automorphic system.*

2.5 Counter-examples

Example 32 *Let $X \subset \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}_+}$ be the subshift consisting of sequences that contain at most one 1. For every $x, y \in X$, $d_b(x, y) = 0$, so (X, σ) is very weakly equicontinuous. Nonetheless, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, $\underline{D}\{i \in \mathbb{Z}_+ : \exists x \in B_\varepsilon(0^\infty)$ s.t. $x_i = 1\} = 1$ so 0^∞ is not a weak equicontinuity point.*

Definition 33 *Let (X, T) be a TDS, and $A_1, A_2 \subset X$. We say $S \subset \mathbb{G}$ is an **independence set for** A_1, A_2 if for every non-empty finite subset $F \subset S$ we have*

$$\cap_{i \in F} T^{-i} A_{v(i)} \neq \emptyset$$

for any $v \in \{1, 2\}^F$.

Theorem 34 ([24]) *Let $\mathbb{G}$ be discrete and countable and (X, T) a $\mathbb{G}-$TDS. The system (X, T) is not null if and only if there exists $x, y \in X$ (with $x \neq y$), such that for all neighbourhoods U_x of x and U_y of y there exists an arbitrarily large finite independence set for U_x and U_y.*

Example 35 *Let $S \subset \mathbb{Z}_+$ be infinite with $\overline{D}(S) = 0$,*

$$Y := \left\{x \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}_+} : x_i = 0 \text{ if } i \notin S\right\},$$

and X the shift-closure of Y. For every $x, y \in X$ we have $d_b(x, y) = 0$, hence (X, σ) is very weakly equicontinuous. Nonetheless, since S is an infinite independence set for $\{x_0 = 0\}, \{x_0 = 1\}$ we conclude that (X, σ) is not null.

A $\mathbb{Z}_+-$subshift is **Toeplitz** if and only if it is the orbit closure of a **regularly recurrent point**, i.e. $x \in X$ such that for every $j > 0$ there exists $m > 0$ such that $x_j = x_{j+im}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Toeplitz subshifts are precisely the minimal subshifts that are almost 1-1 extensions of odometers (for $\mathbb{Z}_+-$actions see [8], for finitely generated discrete group actions see [7]).

Given a Toeplitz subshift and and a regularly recurrent point $x \in X$, there exists a set of pairwise disjoint arithmetic progressions $\{S_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ (called the **periodic structure**) such that $\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} S_n = \mathbb{Z}_+$, x_i is constant for every $i \in S_n$, and every S_n is maximal in the sense that there is no larger arithmetic progression where x_i is constant. Let x be a regularly recurrent point and X the orbit closure. We have that (X, σ) is regular if and only if $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{D}(S_n) = 1$ (see [8]).

Proposition 36 *There exists a non-null weakly equicontinuous Toeplitz subshift (hence minimal).*

Proof. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and w^n be a finite word that contains all the binary words of size n. We denote the concatenation of w^n by $w^{n,\infty} \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}_+}$.

We define the sequence $\{j_n\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ inductively with $j_1 = 0$ and $j_{n+1} := \min\left\{\cup_{m\leq n} \cup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \left\{k2^m + j_m\right\}\right\}^c$.

Let $x \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}_+}$ be the point such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that $x_{j_n+i2^n} = w_i^{n,\infty}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.

We define X as the orbit closure of x. Since x is regularly recurrent we obtain that X is a Toeplitz subshift (hence almost automorphic). By using the condition for regularity using the periodic structure (see comment before this proposition) we obtain that (X,σ) is regular. Hence by Theorem 30 we get that (X,σ) is weakly equicontinuous.

On the other hand w^k contains all the binary words of size k. This implies there exists arbitrarily long independence sets for $\{x_0 = 0\}, \{x_0 = 1\}$. Using Theorem 34 we conclude (X,σ) is not null. ■

A well known generalization of equicontinuous systems are the distal systems (see [3] Chapter 5). Sturmian subshifts and regular Toeplitz subshifts are weakly equicontinuous (see Theorem 30) but not distal. On the other hand, Example 5 in Chapter 2 in [6] is a distal system that is not very weakly equicontinuous. Since distal systems have zero topological entropy, this also provides an example of a system with zero topological entropy that is not very weakly equicontinuous.

Another class of rigid TDS are the tame systems introduced in [26][15]. These systems were characterized in [24] similarly to Theorem 34 but with infinitely large independence sets. This means that Example 35 is also not tame. The example in Section 11 in [24] is a tame non-regular Toeplitz subshift; this means there are tame minimal systems that are not weakly equicontinuous.

3 Measure theoretical results

Measure theoretical equicontinuity was introduced for cellular automata in [14] as a generalization of topological equicontinuity, and has been studied for TDS in [22][10]. Intuitively this form of equicontinuity means that if two points are close then with high probability they will stay close at all possible futures.

Using a result in [22] and a characterization from [10] we obtain that ergodic $\mu-$equicontinuous TDS have discrete spectrum; nonetheless the converse is not true, for example Sturmian and regular Toeplitz subshifts (equipped with their unique ergodic measure) are non $\mu-$equicontinuous systems with discrete spectrum. We have seen these kind of systems are weakly equicontinuous.

In this section we introduce $\mu-$very weak equicontinuity, a measure theoretical form of very weak equicontinuity. In Section 3.1 we will characterize these systems in general (when the measure is not necessarily invariant). In Section 3.2 we will define $\mu-$very strong sensitivity, and we will show ergodic TDS are either $\mu-$equicontinuous or $\mu-$strongly sensitive. In Section 3.3 we will show

characterize $\mu-$very strong sensitivity using $\mu-$very strongly sensitive pairs. In Section 3.2 we will prove the main result. We will show every ergodic TDS with discrete spectrum is $\mu-$very weakly equicontinuous and we will prove the converse is true when the action is countable and discrete (by showing that every $\mu-$very weakly equicontinuous system has zero measure sequence entropy).

Predictability is a good adjective to use to describe non-chaotic systems. For $\mathbb{Z}_+-$actions, zero entropy systems are the ones where if you know information of all the past then you can predict the immediate future with probability one. Here we show that systems with zero sequence entropy are the ones where if you know sufficient information of the present with high probability you can predict information of most of the possible futures.

A $\mathbb{G}$ **-measure preserving transformation ($\mathbb{G}-$MPT)** is a triplet (M, μ, T) where (M, μ) is a probability space and $T := \left\{T^i : i \in \mathbb{G}\right\}$ is a $\mathbb{G}-$ measure preserving action on M.

When we say a dynamical system is ergodic it means it is measure preserving and ergodic.

For some of the results in this section we will assume the pointwise ergodic theorem holds.

Let (M, μ, T) be an ergodic $\mathbb{G}-$MPT. We say $x \in M$ is a **generic point** if for every $\mu-$measurable set A we have that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\nu\left\{i \in F_n : T^i x \in A\right\}}{\nu(F_n)} = \mu(A).$$

We say the a $\mathbb{G}-$MPT satisfies the **pointwise ergodic theorem** if almost every point is a generic point. The ergodic pointwise theorem was originally proved for $\mathbb{Z}_+-$systems by Birkhoff. It also holds if $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{Z}_+^d$ [17]. Every second countable amenable group has a Følner sequence that satisfies the pointwise ergodic theorem [31] (note that this is not satisfied for every Følner sequence). For other conditions when this holds see Chapter 6.4 in [27].

3.1 $\mu-$Very weak equicontinuity

In this subsection we define the measure theoretical form of very weak equicontinuity, and we characterize it.

An abstract result regarding functions con metric measure spaces was proved in [11] to characterize $\mu-$equicontinuity. As we will see we can use the same result to characterize $\mu-$very weak equicontinuity.

This characterizations uses a more abstract result based on different forms of measure theoretical continuity. This result was proved to characterize $\mu-$equicontinuous systems in [10].

In this section we denote Borel probability measures of X as μ and we denote $\mathcal{B}_X^+ := \{A \text{ Borel} : \mu(A) > 0\}$.

Definition 37 *Let (X,T) be a TDS and μ a (non necessarily invariant) Borel probability measure on X. We say (X,T) is $\mu-$**very weakly equicontinuous** if for every $\kappa>0$ there exists a compact set M such that $\mu(M)>1-\kappa$ and $T\restriction_M$ is very weakly equicontinuous i.e. for every $x\in X\cap M$ and every $\varepsilon>0$ there exists $\delta>0$ such that if $y\in B_\delta(x)\cap M$ then $\overline{D}(i\in\colon d(T^ix,T^iy)\leq\varepsilon)\geq 1-\varepsilon$ (this implies that $f_b\restriction_M$ is continuous).*

Definition 38 *Let X be a compact metric space, μ a Borel probability measure, and Y a metric space (with $\varepsilon-$balls denoted by $B_e^Y(y)$).*

*A set $A\subset X$ is $\mu-$**measurable** if A is in the sigma-algebra generated by the completion of μ.*

*The function $f:X\to Y$ is $\mu-$**measurable** if for every Borel set $D\subset Y$, we have that $f^{-1}(D)$ is $\mu-$measurable.*

*A point $x\in X$ is a $\mu-$**continuity** point [10] if for every $\varepsilon>0$ we have that $f^{-1}(B_e^Y(f(x))$ is $\mu-$measurable and*

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0}\frac{\mu(B_\delta(x)\cap f^{-1}(B_e^Y(f(x))))}{\mu(B_\delta(x))}=1. \tag{1}$$

*The function $f:X\to Y$ is $\mu-$**continuous** if the set of $\mu-$continuity points has full measure.*

*The function $f:X\to Y$ is $\mu-$**Lusin** (or **Lusin measurable**) if for every $\varepsilon>0$ there exists a compact set $M\subset X$ such that $\mu(M)>1-\varepsilon$ and $f\restriction_M$ is continuous.*

Theorem 39 ([10]) *Let X be a compact metric space, μ a Borel probability measure, Y a metric space, and $f:X\to Y$ a function. The following are equivalent:*

1) f is $\mu-$continuous.

2) f is $\mu-$Lusin.

3)For every $\kappa>0$, there exists a compact set M such that $\mu(M)>1-\kappa$ and $f\restriction_M$ is $\mu-$continuous, i.e. for every $\varepsilon>0$, $x\in M$, $f^{-1}(B_e^Y(f(x))$ is $\mu-$measurable, and

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0}\frac{\mu(B_\delta(x)\cap f^{-1}(B_e^Y(f(x)))\cap M)}{\mu(B_\delta(x)\cap M)}=1\ .$$

4) For every ε,$\kappa>0$ there exists a finite set $F_{m,\kappa}\subset X$, such that

$$\mu(\cup_{x\in F}f^{-1}(B_e^Y(f(x)))>1-\kappa.$$

One can check that a (X,T) is $\mu-$very weakly equicontinuous if and only if f_b is $\mu-$continuous. Hence we obtain the following corollary by taking $f=f_b$ and $d_Y=d_b$ (hence $B_e^Y=B_\varepsilon^b$).

Corollary 40 *Let (X,T) be a TDS and μ a Borel probability measure. The following are equivalent:*

1) T is $\mu-$very weakly equicontinuous.

2)For a.e. $x \in X$ we have that for every $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{\mu(B_\delta(x) \cap B^b_\varepsilon(x))}{\mu(B_\delta(x))} = 1.$$

3) For every $\kappa > 0$ there exists a compact set M such that $\mu(M) > 1 - \kappa$ and $T_{\restriction M}$ is $\mu-$very weakly equicontinuous, i.e. for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x \in M$ we have that

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{\mu(B_\delta(x) \cap B^b_\varepsilon(x) \cap M)}{\mu(B_\delta(x) \cap M)} = 1.$$

4) For every ε,$\kappa > 0$ there exists a finite set $F_{\varepsilon,\kappa} \subset X$, such that

$$\mu(\cup_{x \in F_{\varepsilon,\kappa}} B^b_\varepsilon(x)) > 1 - \kappa.$$

Definition 41 *A point $x \in X$ is a $\mu-$**very weak equicontinuity point** if for every $\varepsilon > 0$*

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{\mu(B_\delta(x) \cap B^b_\varepsilon(x))}{\mu(B_\delta(x))} = 1.$$

This means that (X, T) is $\mu-$very weakly equicontinuous if and only if $\mu-$almost every x is a $\mu-$very weak equicontinuity point.

When μ is an ergodic measure we can obtain more characterizations (see section 4.3); for example we will see that a TDS with one $\mu-$very weak equicontinuity point is $\mu-$very weakly equicontinuous.

We can similarly define $\mu-$weakly equicontinuous systems, but we currently don't have results involving this notion.

From now on we will only study ergodic systems. Measure theoretic equicontinuity has also been studied under non invariant measures; for example the existence and ergodicity of limit measures of $\mu-$equicontinuous cellular automata was studied in [12].

3.2 $\mu-$Very strong sensitivity

In [22] different characterizations of $\mu-$equicontinuity and $\mu-$sensitivity for ergodic systems were studied. In this subsection we prove analogous results. We also show that $\mu-$very weak equicontinuity is a measurable invariant property for TDS.

Definition 42 *A TDS (X, T) is $\mu-$**very strongly sensitive** if there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every $A \in \mathcal{B}^+_X$ there exists $x, y \in A$ such that $d_b(x, y) > \varepsilon$ (i.e. $\overline{D}\left\{i \in \mathbb{G} : d(T^i x, T^i y) > \varepsilon\right\} > \varepsilon$). In this case we say ε is a **sensitive constant.***

Note than in the topological section we defined very strong sensitivity using lower density, and this definition uses upper density. A consequence of Theorem 45 is that both definitions are equivalent when (X, T) is $\mu-$ergodic (See Remark 46).

Lemma 43 *Let (Y, d_Y) be a metric space. Suppose that there is no uncountable set $A \subset Y$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $d_Y(x, y) > \varepsilon$ for every $x, y \in A$ with $x \neq y$, then (Y, d_Y) is separable.*

Proof. For every $\varepsilon > 0$ rational we define:

$$\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon := \{A \subset Y : d_Y(x, y) > \varepsilon \ \forall x \neq y \in A\}.$$

Using Zorn's lemma we obtain that $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon$ admits a maximal element M_ε, which by hypothesis must be countable. Then $M := \cup_{\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_+} M_\varepsilon$ is also countable. We have that for every $x \in X$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $y \in M$ such that $d_Y(x, y) \leq \varepsilon$. ■

Lemma 44 *Let (X, μ, T) be an ergodic TDS. Then $f(x) = \mu(B_\varepsilon^b(x))$ is constant for almost every $x \in X$ and equal to $\mu \times \mu \{(x, y) : d_b(x, y) \leq \varepsilon\}$.*

Proof. Since

$$d_b(x, y) = \inf \left\{ \delta \mid \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{\left| \left\{ i \in \mathbb{G} \mid d(T^i x, T^i y) > \delta \right\} \cap F_n \right|}{|F_n|} < \delta \right\},$$

one can check that $d_b(x, y)$ is $\mu \times \mu-$measurable. This means that for every $\varepsilon > 0$, $\{(x, y) : d_b(x, y) \leq \varepsilon\}$ is $\mu \times \mu-$measurable. Using Fubini's Theorem we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \times \mu \{(x, y) : d_b(x, y) \leq \varepsilon\} &= \int_X \int_X 1_{\{(x,y) : d_b(x,y) \leq \varepsilon\}} d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_X \mu \{y : d_b(x, y) \leq \varepsilon\} d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_X \mu(B_\varepsilon^b(x)) d\mu(x). \end{aligned}$$

Since f is T-invariant we conclude that $f(x)$ is constant for almost every $x \in X$ and equal to $\mu \times \mu \{(x, y) : d_b(x, y) \leq \varepsilon\}$. ■

Theorem 45 *Let (X, μ, T) be an ergodic TDS. The following are equivalent:*
1) *(X, T) is $\mu-$very strongly sensitive.*
2) *There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\mu \times \mu \{(x, y) : d_b(x, y) > \varepsilon\} = 1$.*
3) *There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for almost every x, $\mu(B_\varepsilon^b(x)) = 0$.*
4)*(X, T) is not $\mu-$very weakly equicontinuous.*
5)*X contains no $\mu-$very weak equicontinuity points.*

Proof. 2) $\Rightarrow$ 1)

Let $A \in B_X^+$. This means that $A \times A \in B_{X^2}^+$ by hypothesis we can find $(x, y) \in A \times A$ such that $\overline{D} \left\{ i : d(T^i x, T^i y) > \varepsilon \right\} > \varepsilon$.

1) $\Rightarrow$ 3)

Suppose T is $\mu-$very strongly sensitive, with sensitive constant ε but that 3) is not satisfied. This means there exists x such that $B^b_{\varepsilon/2}(x) \in B^+_X$. For any $y, z \in B^b_{\varepsilon/2}(x)$ we have that $d_b(y,z) \leq \varepsilon$ and hence

$$\overline{D}\left\{i : d(T^i y, T^i z) \leq \varepsilon\right\} > 1 - \varepsilon.$$

This contradicts the assumption that T is $\mu-$strongly sensitive.

3) $\Rightarrow$ 2)

Using Lemma 44 we obtain that $\mu \times \mu\left\{(x,y) : \underline{d_b}(x,y) \leq \varepsilon\right\} = 0$.

3) $\Rightarrow$ 5)

Suppose x is a $\mu-$very weak equicontinuity point. This implies that $\mu(B^b_\varepsilon(x)) > 0$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$.

5) $\Rightarrow$ 4)

Trivial.

4) $\Rightarrow$ 3)

Suppose 3) is not satisfied. By Lemma 44 we have that there exists a set of full measure Y, such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $a_\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\mu(B^b_\varepsilon(x)) = a_\varepsilon$ for all $x \in Y$. If $(Y/d_b, d_b)$ is not separable by Lemma 43 there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and an uncountable set A such that for every $x, y \in A$ such that $x \neq y$ we have that $B^b_\varepsilon(x) \cap B^b_\varepsilon(y) = \emptyset$. This is a contradiction, hence $(Y/d_b, d_b)$ is separable. Using Corollary 40 4) we conclude (X,T) is $\mu-$very weakly equicontinuous. ■

Remark 46 *Let (X,μ,T) be a measure preserving TDS. We say (X,μ,T) is $\mu-\underline{very}$ weak equicontinuity if it satisifes the definition of $\mu-$very weak equicontinuity with lower density (instead of upper), and we say (X,μ,T) is $\mu-\underline{very}$ strong sensitivity is it satifies the definition of $\mu-$very weak equicontinuity with lower density. It is clear that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mu - \underline{very}\ \text{weak equicontinuity} &\Rightarrow \mu - \text{very weak equicontinuity, and} \\ \mu - \underline{very}\ \text{strong sensitivity} &\Rightarrow \mu - \text{very strong sensitivity.} \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand we can similarly prove an analogous of Theorem 45. This means that for ergodic TDS

$$\mu - \underline{very}\ \text{weak equicontinuity} \Rightarrow \text{not } \mu\text{-}\underline{very}\ \text{strongly sensitivity.}$$

Thus we obtain that for ergodic TDS

$$\begin{aligned} \mu - \text{very weak equicontinuity} &\Leftrightarrow \mu - \underline{very}\ \text{weak equicontinuity, and} \\ \mu - \text{very strong sensitivity} &\Leftrightarrow \mu - \underline{very}\ \text{strong sensitivity.} \end{aligned}$$

Definition 47 *Two measure preserving transformations, (M,μ,T) and (M',μ',T'), are **isomorphic (measurably)** if there exists an a.e. bijective and measure preserving function $f : (M,\mu) \to (M',\mu')$ such that $T \circ f = f \circ T'$.*

Proposition 48 *Let (X,μ,T) and (X',μ',T') be two isomorphic ergodic TDS. If (X,μ,T) is $\mu-$very weakly equicontinuous then (X',μ',T') is $\mu-$very weakly equicontinuous.*

Proof. We will denote with d and d' the metrics of X and X' respectively.

Suppose (X',μ',T') is not $\mu-$very weakly equicontinuous. By Theorem 45 there exists $\varepsilon>0$ and a set $Y'\subset X'\times X'$such that for every $(x',y')\in Y'$ we have that $d_b(x,y)>\varepsilon$ and $\mu\times\mu(Y')=1$.

Let $f:X\to X'$ be the measure preserving isomorphism. By Lusin's Theorem we know that there exists a compact set $K\subset X$ such that $\mu(K)\geq 1-\varepsilon/4$ and $f\mid_K$ is continuous and bijective. This means there exists ε_1 such that if $x',y'\in f(K)$ and $d'(x',y')>\varepsilon$ then $d(f^{-1}(x'),f^{-1}(y'))>\varepsilon_1$. This implies that $\underline{D}\Big\{i\in\mathbb{G}: d(T'^i f(x),T'^i f(y)\ >\varepsilon\Big\}>\varepsilon$ (see Remark 46). We define

$$\begin{aligned} E_1(x,y) &: = \left\{i\in\mathbb{G}: T^ix,T^iy\in K\ \right\},\text{ and}\\ E_2(x,y) &: = \left\{i\in\mathbb{G}: d(T^ix,T^iy)\ >\varepsilon_1\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let x,y be generic points such that $(f(x),f(y))\in Y'$. Using that $\mu(K)\geq 1-\varepsilon/4$ and the ergodic theorem we have that $\underline{D}(E_1(x,y))\geq 1-\varepsilon/2$. Since $\Big\{i\in\mathbb{G}: d(T'^i f(x),T'^i f(y)\ >\varepsilon\Big\}\subset E_2(x,y)$ we have that $\overline{D}(E_2(x,y))\geq\varepsilon$. This means that for a.e. $x,y\in X$ we have that $d(T^ix,T^iy)>\varepsilon_1$ for every $i\in E_1(x,y)\cap E_2(x,y)$, and that $\overline{D}(E_1(x,y)\cap E_2(x,y))\geq\varepsilon/2$. Hence (X,μ,T) is not $\mu-$very weak equicontinuous. ■

3.3 $\mu-$Very strong sensitive pairs

The notion of entropy pairs was introduced in [4]. Different kinds of pairs have been studied, in particular sequence entropy pairs in [23] and $\mu-$sensitive pairs [22]. In [22] $\mu-$sensitive pairs were used to characterize $\mu-$sensitivity; we introduce $\mu-$very strong sensitive pairs to characterize $\mu-$very strong sensitivity, and to show $\mu-$very weakly equicontinuous TDS have zero entropy.

Definition 49 *We say $(x,y)\in X^2$ is a $\mu-$**very strongly sensitive pair** if $x\neq y$ and for all open neighbourhoods U_x of x and U_y of y, there exists $\varepsilon>0$ such that for every $A\in\mathcal{B}_X^+$ there exist $p,q\in A$ and $S\subset\mathbb{G}$ with $\overline{D}(S)>\varepsilon$ such that $T^ip\in U_x$ and $T^iq\in U_y$ for every $i\in S$. We denote the set of $\mu-$strongly sensitive pairs as $S^s_\mu(X,T)$.*

Definition 50 *For $\varepsilon>0$ we define the compact set*

$$X^\varepsilon:=\left\{(x,y)\in X^2\mid d(x,y)\geq\varepsilon\right\}.$$

Theorem 51 *Let (X,μ,T) be an ergodic TDS. Then $S^s_\mu(X,T)\neq\emptyset$ if and only if (X,T) is $\mu-$very strongly sensitive.*

Proof. If $S^s_\mu(X,T) \neq \emptyset$ then (X,T) is $\mu-$very strongly sensitive by definition.

Let (X,T) be $\mu-$very strongly sensitive with sensitive constant ε_0 and $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$.

Suppose that $S^s_\mu(X,T) = \emptyset$. This means that for every $(x,y) \in X^\varepsilon$ there exist open neighbourhoods U_x, U_y, such that for every $\delta > 0$ there exists a set $A_\delta(x,y) \in \mathcal{B}^+_X$ such that

$$\overline{D}\left\{i \in \mathbb{G} : (T^i p, T^i q) \in U_x \times U_y\right\} \leq \delta$$

for all $p, q \in A_\delta(x,y)$.

There exists a finite set of points $F \subset X^\varepsilon$ such that

$$X^\varepsilon \subseteq \cup_{(x,y)\in F} U_x \times U_y.$$

Since μ is ergodic we have that for every $(x,y) \in F$ there exists $n(x,y) \in \mathbb{G}$ such that $A := \cap_{(x,y)\in F} T^{n(x,y)} A_{\varepsilon/|F|}(x,y) \in \mathcal{B}^+_X$. Thus for every $(x,y) \in F$ we have that

$$\overline{D}\left\{i \in \mathbb{G} : (T^i p, T^i q) \in U_x \times U_y\right\} \leq \varepsilon/|F|,$$

for every $p, q \in A$.

Since ε is smaller than a sensitive constant there exist $p, q \in A$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{D}\left\{i : (T^i p, T^i q) \in X^\varepsilon\right\} &> \varepsilon, \text{ and hence} \\ \overline{D}\left\{i : (T^i p, T^i q) \in \cup_{(x,y)\in F} U_x \times U_y\right\} &> \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

We have a contradiction since this means there exists $(x', y') \in F$ such that

$$\overline{D}\left\{i : (T^i p, T^i q) \in U_{x'} \times U_{y'}\right\} > \varepsilon/|F|.$$

■

The relationship between entropy (and sequence entropy) and independence was studied in [25]. The following result shows there is a relationship between strongly sensitive pairs and a different kind of measure theoretical independence pairs.

Lemma 52 *Let $\mathbb{G}$ be abelian and (X,μ,T) be a $\mathbb{G}-TDS$ that satisfies the pointwise ergodic theorem. Suppose that $x \neq y$ and that for all open neighbourhoods U_x of x and U_y of y, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for every N there exists $S_N \subset \mathbb{G}$, with $|S_N| \geq N$, such that for all $s_i, s_j \in S_N$ we have that $\mu(T^{-s_i}U_x \cap T^{-s_j}U_y) > \delta$. Then $(x,y) \in S^s_\mu(T)$.*

Proof. Let $A \in \mathcal{B}^+_X$. There exist $N > 0$ and $s_1, s_2 \in S_N$ such that

$$\mu(T^{-s_1}A \cap T^{-s_2}A) > 0.$$

This means there exists a generic point $z \in T^{-s_{t_1}}A \cap T^{-s_{t_2}}A$.

Let $W := T^{-s_1}U_x \cap T^{-s_2}U_y$ and $S := \left\{ i > s_2 \mid T^i z \in W \right\}$. By hypothesis we have that $\mu(W) > \delta$, and hence $\overline{D}(S) = \mu(W) > \delta$. Let $p := T^{s_1} z$ and $q := T^{s_2} z$. We have that $p, q \in A$ and $T^i p \in U_x$ and $T^i q \in U_y$ for every $i \in S$.This means that $(x, y) \in S^s_\mu(T)$. ■

To define measure entropy we will assume the group action is countable.

Definition 53 *The entropy of a finite measurable partition $\mathcal{P}$ of a probability space (M, μ) is defined by $H(\mathcal{P}) = -\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mu(P) \ln \mu(P)$.*

*Let $\mathbb{G}$ be countable and (M, μ, T) be a $\mathbb{G}-MPT$. Given $\mathcal{P}$, a finite measurable partition of M, we define $h_\mu(\mathcal{P}, T) := \lim \frac{1}{|F_n|} H(\vee_{i \in F_n} T^{-i}\mathcal{P})$, and the **entropy of** (M, μ, T) as $h_\mu(T) := \sup_{\mathcal{P}} h_\mu(\mathcal{P}, T)$.*

For more information of entropy on amenable actions see [34].

Proposition 54 *Let $\mathbb{G}$ be countable discrete and abelian, and (X, μ, T) an ergodic $\mathbb{G}-TDS$ that satisfies the pointwise ergodic theorem. If (X, μ, T) is $\mu-$very weakly equicontinuous then it has zero entropy.*

Proof. Suppose (X, μ, T) has positive entropy. By Proposition 2.16 (2) in [25] (see also Definitions 1.1 and 2.5) we obtain that there exist $x \neq y$ such that for all open neighbourhoods U_x of x and U_y of y there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for every N there exists $S_N \subset \mathbb{G}$, with $|S_N| \geq N$, such that for all $s_i, s_j \in S_N$ and $D \subset X$ with $\mu(D) > 1 - \delta$ we have that $D \cap T^{-s_i}U_x \cap T^{-s_j}U_y \neq \emptyset$ (the conclusion of Proposition 2.16 is that there exists a $\mu-$IE pair; this implies that for any Følner sequence there exist arbitrarily large N and a subset $S_N \subset \mathbb{G}$, that satisfies the previous condition, such that $\frac{|S_N \cap F_N|}{|F_N|}$ is bounded below). This implies that for every $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that $\mu(T^{-s_i}U_x \cap T^{-s_j}U_y) > \delta$. Using Lemma 52 we conclude that $(x, y) \in S^s_\mu(T)$; hence (X, μ, T) is not $\mu-$very weakly equicontinuous. ■

3.4 Discrete spectrum and sequence entropy

3.4.1 Sequence entropy

Definition 55 ([29]) *Let (M, μ, T) be a measure preserving transformation. Given a finite measurable partition $\mathcal{P}$ of X and $S = \{s_n\} \subset \mathbb{G}$ we define $h^S_\mu(\mathcal{P}, T) := \limsup_{n \to \infty} H(\vee_{i=1}^n T^{-s_i}\mathcal{P})$, and the **sequence entropy of** (X, μ, T) **with respect to** S as $h^S_\mu(T) := \sup_{\mathcal{P}} \ h^S_\mu(\mathcal{P}, T)$. The system is said to be **μ-null** if $h^S_\mu(T) = 0$ for every $S \subset \mathbb{G}$.*

It is not difficult to see that $\mu-$null systems have zero entropy.

The following remarkable lemma provides a connection between entropy and functional analysis.

Lemma 56 ([29]) *Let (M,μ) be a probability space and $\{\xi_n\}$ be a sequence of two-set partitions of M, with $\xi_n = (P_n, P_n^c)$. The closure of $\{1_{P_1}, 1_{P_2}...\} \subset L^2(M)$ is compact if and only if for any subsequence*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H(\xi_{m_1}, ..., \xi_{m_n}) = 0.$$

A consequence of Krieger's generator theorem is that every ergodic transformation with finite entropy is measurably isomorphic to a subshift. Krieger's generator theorem was first stated for $\mathbb{Z}_+-$systems [28] and has been generalized for countable amenable free group actions [36]. An action is free if periodic points have zero measure.

One can check that every ergodic system with a non-free action is $\mu-$null.

Theorem 57 *Let $\mathbb{G}$ be a countable discrete abelian semigroup and (X,T) an ergodic $\mathbb{G}-$TDS that satisfies the ergodic pointwise theorem. If (X,T) is $\mu-$very weakly equicontinuous then it is $\mu-$null.*

Proof. Considering Proposition 48 , Proposition 54, and the previous comment, it is enough to prove the result for subshifts.

Let (X,σ) be an ergodic subshift with positive sequence entropy. This means there exists $S = \{s_n\} \subset \mathbb{G}$ and a two-set partition of compact sets $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, P_2)$ such that $h_\mu^S(\mathcal{P}, T) > 0$.

Define $\xi_n = (P_n, P_n^c) := (\sigma^{-s_n} P_1, \sigma^{-s_n} P_2)$. Considering Lemma 56 we have that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and infinite $S' \subset S$ such that

$$\mu(P_i \triangle P_j) = \int \left|1_{P_i} - 1_{P_j}\right|^2 d\mu \geq \varepsilon \text{ for every } i \neq j \in S'. \tag{2}$$

Let $A \in \mathcal{B}_X^+$. There exist $t_1, t_2 \in S'$ such that

$$\mu(\sigma^{-s_{t_1}} A \cap \sigma^{-s_{t_2}} A) > 0.$$

This means there exists a generic point $z \in \sigma^{-s_{t_1}} A \cap \sigma^{-s_{t_2}} A$.

Let $W := (\sigma^{-s_{t_1}} P_1 \cap \sigma^{-s_{t_2}} P_1^c) \cup (\sigma^{-s_{t_1}} P_1^c \cap \sigma^{-s_{t_2}} P_1)$ and $S_W := \left\{i > s_{t_2} \mid \sigma^i z \in W\right\}$. By (2) we have that $\mu(W) > \varepsilon$; hence by the ergodic pointwise theorem $\overline{D}(S_W) = \mu(W) > \varepsilon$. Let $p := \sigma^{s_{t_1}} z$ and $q := \sigma^{s_{t_2}} z$. Using the fact that $\mathbb{G}$ is abelian we have that for every $i \in S_W$, either

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^i p &\in P_1 \text{ and } \sigma^i q \in P_1^c, \text{ or} \\ \sigma^i p &\in P_1^c \text{ and } \sigma^i q \in P_1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $d(\sigma^i p, \sigma^i q) \geq d(P_1, P_1^c)$. This means that (X,σ) is not $\mu-$very weakly equicontinuous. ■

3.4.2 Discrete spectrum

A measure preserving transformation is a **measurable isometry** if it is isomorphic to an isometry.

A measure preserving transformation on a probability space (M,μ,T) generates a family of unitary linear operator on the Hilbert space $L^2(M,\mu)$, by

$U_{T^i} : f \mapsto f \circ T^i$. We say (M, μ, T) has **discrete spectrum** if $L^2(M, \mu)$ is the direct sum of finite dimensional U_T-invariant subspaces. It was shown first for $\mathbb{Z}_+$-actions (by Halmos and Von Neumann [19]) and later (by Mackey [32]) for locally compact group actions that an ergodic system is a measurable isometry if and only if it has discrete spectrum. For $\mathbb{Z}$-actions, Kushnirenko proved that an ergodic system is $\mu-$null if and only if it has discrete spectrum [29]. This result was generalized for discrete actions in [25].

Theorem 58 *Let (X, μ, T) be an ergodic TDS. If (X, μ, T) has discrete spectrum then it is $\mu-$very weakly equicontinuous.*

Proof. This follows from the Halmos-Von Neumman- Mackey Theorem and Proposition 48. ■

Corollary 59 *Let $\mathbb{G}$ be a countable discrete abelian group and (X, μ, T) an ergodic $\mathbb{G}-$TDS that satisfies the ergodic pointwise theorem. Then (X, μ, T) has discrete spectrum if and only if it is $\mu-$very weakly equicontinuous.*

3.4.3 Similar results for $\mathbb{R}^d-$tiling dynamical systems

Tiling systems are particular kind of $\mathbb{R}^d-$TDS. Results from [18][38] imply that if every point of a tiling system is almost periodic with respect to the Besicovitch pseudometric then the system has discrete spectrum (these results are not written specifically for tiling systems but for systems that are very related to tiling systems e.g. systems that arise from Delone sets). Since a minimal system is almost periodic with respect the regular metric and very weak equicontinuity means the change of metric is continuous; we obtain that every very weakly equicontinuous minimal tiling system has discrete spectrum.

3.4.4 Mean-L-stable systems

While finishing the paper I became aware that the mean-L-stable systems introduced in [9] are precisely the very weakly equicontinuous $\mathbb{Z}_+-$systems.

In [2] it was shown mean-L-stable systems are uniquely ergodic. It was asked in [37] if every mean-L-stable system equipped with an ergodic measure has discrete spectrum. Corollary 59 implies the answer of this question is positive. This question has been independently solved directly in [30] using different tools.

References

[1] E. Akin, J. Auslander, and K. Berg. When is a transitive map chaotic? *Ohio State Univ. Math. Res. Inst. Publ.* **5**(2), 25–40 (1996).

[2] J. Auslander. Mean-l-stable systems. *Illinois Journal of Mathematics* **3**(4), 566–579 (1959).

[3] J. Auslander. "Minimal Flows and Their Extensions". North-Holland Mathematics Studies. Elsevier Science (1988).

[4] F. Blanchard. A disjointness theorem involving topological entropy. *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **121**(4), 465–478 (1993).

[5] F. Blanchard, E. Formenti, and P. Kurka. Cellular automata in the cantor, besicovitch and weyl spaces. (1998).

[6] J. R. Brown. "Ergodic theory and topological dynamics", vol. 70. Academic Press (1976).

[7] M. Cortez. G-odometers and their almost one-to-one extensions. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* **78**(1), 1–20 (2008).

[8] T. Downarowicz. Survey of odometers and toeplitz flows. *Contemporary Mathematics* **385**, 7–38 (2005).

[9] S. Fomin. On dynamical systems with pure point spectrum. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR,* **77**(4), 29–32 (1951).

[10] F. García-Ramos. $\mu-$equicontinuity: dynamics and limit behaviour. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1309.0467* (2013).

[11] F. García-Ramos. A characterization of $\mu-$equicontinuity. *preprint* (2014).

[12] F. García-Ramos. Limit behaviour of $\mu-$equicontinuous cellular automata. *preprint* (2014).

[13] R. Gilman. Periodic behavior of linear automata. In J. Alexander, editor, "Dynamical Systems", vol. 1342 of "Lecture Notes in Mathematics", pp. 216–219. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg (1988). 10.1007/BFb0082833.

[14] R. H. Gilman. Classes of linear automata. *Ergodic Theory Dyn. Syst.* **7**, 105–118 (1987).

[15] E. Glasner. On tame dynamical systems. *Colloq. Math* pp. 283–295 (2006).

[16] T. Goodman. Topological sequence entropy. *Proc. London Math. Soc* **29**(3), 331–350 (1974).

[17] A. Gorodnik and A. Nevo. "The Ergodic Theory of Lattice Subgroups (AM-172)". Annals of Mathematics Studies. Princeton University Press (2009).

[18] J.-B. Gouere. Quasicrystals and almost periodicity. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **255**(3), 655–681 (2005).

[19] P. R. Halmos and J. von Neumann. Operator methods in classical mechanics, ii. *The Annals of Mathematics* **43**(2), 332–350 (1942).

[20] W. Huang. Tame systems and scrambled pairs under an abelian group action. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems* **26**(5), 1549–1568 (2006).

[21] W. Huang, S. Li, S. Shao, and X. Ye. Null systems and sequence entropy pairs. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems* **23**(5), 1505–1523 (2003).

[22] W. Huang, P. Lu, and X. Ye. Measure-theoretical sensitivity and equicontinuity. *Israel Journal of Mathematics* **183**, 233–283 (2011).

[23] W. Huang, A. Maass, and X. Ye. Sequence entropy pairs and complexity pairs for a measure. *Annales de l'Institut Fourier* **54**(4), 1005–1028 (2004).

[24] D. Kerr and H. Li. Independence in topological and c*-dynamics. *Mathematische Annalen* **338**(4), 869–926 (2007).

[25] D. Kerr and H. Li. Combinatorial independence in measurable dynamics. *Journal of Functional Analysis* **256**(5), 1341 – 1386 (2009).

[26] A. Köhler. Enveloping semigroups for flows. In "Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy. Section A: Mathematical and Physical Sciences", pp. 179–191. JSTOR (1995).

[27] U. Krengel and A. Brunel. "Ergodic theorems". Cambridge Univ Press (1985).

[28] W. Krieger. On entropy and generators of measure-preserving transformations. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **149**(2), 453–464 (1970).

[29] A. G. Kushnirenko. On metric invariants of entropy type. *Russian Mathematical Surveys* **22**(5), 53 (1967).

[30] J. Li, S. Tu, and X. Ye. Mean equicontinuity and mean sensitivity. *preprint* (2014).

[31] E. Lindenstrauss. Pointwise theorems for amenable groups. *Inventiones mathematicae* **146**(2), 259–295 (2001).

[32] G. W. Mackey. Ergodic transformation groups with a pure point spectrum. *Illinois Journal of Mathematics* **8**(4), 593–600 (1964).

[33] T. K. S. Moothathu. Stronger forms of sensitivity for dynamical systems. *Nonlinearity* **20**(9), 2115 (2007).

[34] D. S. Ornstein and B. Weiss. Entropy and isomorphism theorems for actions of amenable groups. *Journal d'Analyse Mathématique* **48**(1), 1–141 (1987).

[35] J.-P. Pier. "Amenable locally compact groups". Wiley New York (1984).

[36] A. Rosenthal. Finite uniform generators for ergodic, finite entropy, free actions of amenable groups. *Probability theory and related fields* **77**(2), 147–166 (1988).

[37] B. Scarpellini. Stability properties of flows with pure point spectrum. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* **2**(3), 451–464 (1982).

[38] B. Solomyak. Spectrum of dynamical systems arising from delone sets. In "American Math. Soc.: Providence RI", pp. 265–275 (1997).

[39] P. Walters. "An Introduction to Ergodic Theory". Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag (2000).